

REMARKS


After entry of this response, claims 1-20 are pending in the application. The Office Action dated December 10, 2002 imposes an election of species requirement between the invention illustrated in Figures 1-6 and the invention illustrated in Figures 7-11. Currently claims 1, 4-9, 12-16, 19 and 20 are generic to both species. Applicant elects the species illustrated in Figures 1-6 for prosecution on the merits. Claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-17, and 19-20- read on the elected species. Claims 3, 11, and 18 read on the non-elected species illustrated in Figures 7-11. If a generic claim is found to be allowable, applicant requests rejoinder of the non-elected species.

It is respectfully submitted that this Amendment traverses and overcomes all of the Examiner's objections and rejections to the application as originally filed. It is further submitted that this Amendment has antecedent basis in the application as originally filed, including the specification, claims and drawings, and that this Amendment does not add any new subject matter to the application. Reconsideration of the application as amended is requested. It is respectfully submitted that this Amendment places the application in suitable condition for allowance; notice of which is requested.

If the Examiner feels that prosecution of the present application can be expedited by way of an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG, BASILE, HANLON, MacFARLANE, WOOD
& HELMHOLDT, P.C.



Thomas D. Helmholdt
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 33181
(248) 649-3333

3001 West Big Beaver Rd., Suite 624
Troy, Michigan 48084-3107
Dated: January 10, 2003
TDH/cmp